

Mass Transit Aff

Mass Transit Aff	1
1AC—Mass Transportation	2
1AC—Mass Transportation	3
1AC—Mass Transportation	4
1AC—Plan	5
1AC—Racism	6
1AC—Racism	7
1AC—Racism	8
1AC—Racism	9
1AC—Racism	10
1AC—Racism	11
Advantage—No Transit Now	12
Advantage—Transit Key to Community	13
Advantage—Transit Key to Quality of Life	14
Advantage—Transit Funding is Anti-Metro	15
Advantage—Transit Funding Key to the Economy	16
Advantage—Transit Funding Leads to Sprawl	17
Advantage—Transit Funding Racist	18
Advantage—Transit Funding Racist	19
Advantage—Transit Funding Racist	20
Advantage—Racism Impacts (Morality/Violence)	21
Advantage—Racism Impacts (Nuclear War)	22
Advantage—Racism Impacts (Biopower/War)	23
Advantage—Racism Impacts (Deontic)	24
Advantage—Racism Impacts (Ethics/Violence)	25
Solvency—Federal Funding Key	26
Solvency—Federal Support Key	27
AT: Transit Trades-off With Highways	28
AT: Won't Ride It	30
AT: Its Not Explicitly Racist	31
AT: Its "Anti-Metro" Not Racist	32
AT: We Fixed Racism	33
AT: Black White Dichotomy Bad	34
AT: Black White Dichotomy Bad	35
AT: Race Neutrality	36
AT: Disads	37
AT: Politics	38
AT: Generic CPs	39
AT: Private CP	40
AT: States	41
AT: States (Racism)	42
AT: States (Racism)	43
AT: Generic Ks	44
AT: Generic Ks	45
AT: Cap	46
AT: Gender Ks	47
Neg—Transit Funding Unnecessary	48
Neg—Law is Racist	49
Neg—Small Changes Don't Solve	50
Neg—Racism Enduring	51
Neg—State is Racist	52
Neg—Spending Links	53
Neg—States Solve	54
Neg—States Solve	55
Neg—States Solve	56

1AC—Mass Transportation

Observation 1 is Mass Transit:

Federal Support For Mass Transit is Insufficient in the Status Quo—Conservative Opposition Refuses to Expand the Creation of New Infrastructure

Earth Island Journal, "Why Do Conservatives Hate Public Transit?" April 3rd 2012

(http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why_do_conservatives_hate_public_transit)

Once upon a time — in a political environment that seems otherworldly compared to what we have in the United States today — the federal transportation bill was a bi-partisan endeavor. Now things are different. Congress went into spring recess last week and once again left hanging a reauthorization of the transportation bill, [which expired two and a half years ago](#). Congress was just barely able to approve a [temporary, 90-day extension](#) of the lapsed law so that current infrastructure projects can keep moving along.

Why the impasse on something that usually wins consensus? **It comes down, in part, to a disagreement over how (or even whether) the federal government should fund mass transit programs.**

The transportation bill moving through the House eliminates the provision that dedicates to mass transit 20 percent of monies from the gas-tax supported Highway Trust Fund — an arrangement that has been in place since Ronald Reagan was president. It also slashes support for high-speed rail projects, cuts subsidies to Amtrak, and eliminates designated funding for bike and pedestrian infrastructure as well as the "Safe Routes to School" program. **Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood (a former Republican Congressman) called the House measure "the worst transportation bill I've ever seen during 35 years of public service."**

Compare that with the [Senate version](#), which passed with overwhelming bi-partisan support (74-22). The Senate's two-year bill, crafted by odd bedfellows Barbara Boxer and Jim Inhofe, would largely maintain the status quo. The easiest thing would be for the House to take up the Senate version, pass it with bi-partisan numbers, and send the law to the president. But that would rankle Speaker John Boehner's hard-right base. Here's how Congressman Peter DeFazio, a Democrat from Oregon, summed up the situation:

"[The House leadership's] problem is they have about 80 or 90 people who want to kill off the federal transportation program in their caucus. Then they're hamstrung because they've got 20 or 25 [who] are still rational and say, 'Hey, if you're going to kill off transit funding, we won't vote for the bill.' So if they do what the flat earth people want, then they lose the moderates, and if they do what the moderates want they lose the flat earth people."

This legislative train wreck (sorry for the pun) raises a question that's been nagging me for a while: Why exactly are conservative representatives so antagonistic to public transit?

1AC—Mass Transportation

Federal Spending on Transit Infrastructure is Crucial to Create a Viable system Which Provides for Everyone

Hillary Clinton, "Time for federal government to invest more in mass transit system," September 15th, 2008
(http://articles.nydailynews.com/2008-09-15/news/17906441_1_public-transit-transit-systems-subway-cars)

Across the country, communities and states are following New York's lead. **Millions of Americans are clamoring for more public transit. In just the second quarter of this year, Americans took more than 2.8 billion trips on public transportation - 140 million more trips than over the same period last year. As Americans turn to public transportation in greater and greater numbers, the increased demand reveals a transit system that is overstressed and undersized, overflowing and underfunded. As a result, public transportation networks are now being forced to employ stopgap measures to meet surging demand.** For example, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority here in the city is exploring a plan to use folding seats on subway cars in order to pack in more riders. **Public transit systems across the country are faced with a tough choice: cut service or raise fares. For our economy, our environment and the people who depend on public transit, neither is an acceptable option. It's time to make public transportation a public priority. Public transportation is a win-win-win scenario.** Using public transit can save Americans thousands of dollars a year at the gas pump, reduce congestion on our roadways and help us cut our dependence on foreign oil, which hampers our security and pollutes our environment. That is why I've introduced legislation that would authorize \$1.7 billion in federal funds, including \$237 million for New York, to help mass transit systems across the country expand and prepare for the massive rise in commuters. It's called the Saving Energy through Public Transportation Act and it would help people who want to switch from the driver's seat to the passenger seat on commuter trains and buses, subway cars and public transit systems from coast to coast. But that should only be the beginning. **Our crumbling infrastructure constricts our economy and costs us billions in wasted time and fuel. And our failure to invest in infrastructure today is a burden we place on our children and grandchildren.** The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission estimates that \$225 billion each year is required to meet the country's transportation infrastructure needs. We are investing less than half of that. Every day we fall further behind. Compare that with China, currently spending 9% of its GDP on infrastructure, to our 2%. For the past six years and with no signs of slowing down, China has opened at least one new subway system every year. **When Congress considers a new transportation bill next year, we must cast aside business as usual.** We should bring every region of our country together to develop long-term solutions that will create 21st century jobs and a 21st century infrastructure network - to grow a 21st century economy. **Yes, cities like New York are in particularly dire need of new investments in transportation infrastructure. But this isn't just about cities. The suburbs need and deserve big improvements and rural areas do, too.** Fifty-two years ago, President Dwight Eisenhower signed into law the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, approving what was at the time the largest public works project in American history. It was born of a simple idea: For our security and economy, as the world changed and we adapted to new threats and opportunities, America had to be ready and prepared for our future. And so the Interstate Highway System was born. Now it's time again for visionary and determined leadership. We face different challenges - but a task of similar magnitude. To create jobs, cut traffic and congestion, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, stem the tide of harmful pollution and emissions, save families money at the pump and provide our economy the building blocks to grow, **we simply must repair, renew and revitalize our infrastructure - including public transit.**

1AC—Mass Transportation**Federal Funding for the Creation and Operation of Mass Transit Systems is Crucial to Long Term Success**

Rodger James Sillars, former administrator with the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority, "[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php)" National Journal Transportation Blog, June 17th, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php>)

The short answer is that of course **operating expense should be federally funded. It was funded for a good while as the federal role in funding transit began after the mid sixties. It simply made good sense. The problem was that for major players the capital needs were so great at most systems that major efforts were made to fund big capital needs and seek local support for lesser operations needs.** The capital funding needs were just so great. As systems found the need to add funding for major expansion (largely in capital) or to add resources for new mandates to provide accessible services for the disabled (for example) the capital needs were significantly impacted. **The industry simply let the naysayers win the argument and operating assistance was progressively phased out starting with larger systems and eventually working down to more fragile operations in small and rural population centers.** It was a bad deal from the start. **Transit never got anywhere close to full funding for legitimate needs. Systems were forced to locally fund some capital projects or compete to pay a higher matching percentage to get critical projects done. It was the American people who suffered in this situation. They never got many of the service choices that they needed. Even with the generous expansion of support under the current administration the needs in virtually all areas of the country are not being met quickly enough.** The public cannot be allowed to go without existing services because local authorities were unable to foresee or plan for massive cost increases in operations for fuel and massive losses of support from a deeply troubled economy. Affected areas that due to economic factors well beyond their control suddenly find themselves literally knocked down by removal of the local economic lubricant that mass transit provides. The local economic engine literally gets locked up by an artificial barrier put in place without any rational reason, but accepted by various leaders who could not have foreseen either our present economic distress. Long overdue massive starts on addressing local funding needs are tragically made less effective by the funding restrictions that removed the needed sparks to add in restarting the local economic engine.

1AC—Plan

Plan: The United States Federal Government Should Substantially Increase its Funding for the Operation, Maintenance and Construction of Mass Transit Infrastructure in the United States.

1AC—Racism

Observation 2 is Racism:

Federal Transit Decisions Reflect a Deeply Ingrained Racism—Transportation Questions Have Always Been a Fundamental Symbolic and Practical Component of Race Relations in the US

Environmental Justice Resource Center, "Suburban Sprawl and Transportation Racism," The Black Commentator, September 23rd, 2004 (http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html)

In the United States, all communities do not receive the same benefits from transportation advancements and investments. "Suburban sprawl is in part driven by race and class dynamics. Transportation spending has always been about opportunity, fairness, and equity," according to Clark Atlanta University professor Robert D. Bullard.

The modern civil rights movement has its roots in transportation. For more than a century, African Americans and other people of color have struggled to dismantle transportation apartheid policies that use tax dollars to promote economic isolation and social exclusion. The decision to build highways, expressways, and beltways has far-reaching effects on land use, energy policy, and the environment. Similarly, the decisions by county commissioners to limit and even exclude public transit to job-rich suburban economic activity centers have serious mobility implications for central city residents.

Writing in the Foreword to Dr. Bullard's and Angel O. Torres's book, [Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Highways to Equity](#), Congressman John Lewis (D-GA) states, "Our struggle is not over. Today those physical signs are gone, but the legacy of "Jim Crow" transportation is still with us. Even in a city like Atlanta, Georgia, a vibrant city with a modern rail and public transit system, thousands of people have been left out and left behind because of discrimination. Like most other major cities, Atlanta's urban center is worlds apart from its suburbs."

The cash-strapped Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) is the nation's ninth largest transit system and the only major transit system that does not receive any regional or state funding. By comparison, the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (Boston) gets 20 percent of the state's sales tax, or about \$680 million dollars a year. Clearly, MARTA is regional only in name – covering only Fulton and DeKalb Counties and the City of Atlanta. From its inception in the 1960s, race blocked MARTA from becoming a five-county regional system. For many suburban whites, MARTA stood for "Moving Africans Rapidly Through Atlanta." Several suburban Atlanta counties have set up their own "separate and unequal" bus systems, some with the assistance of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority or GRTA, that are marginally linked to MARTA.

Follow the transportation dollars and one can tell who is important and who is not. Between fiscal year 1992 and 1999, states had more than \$33.8 billion in federal funds available to spend on either highways or public transit, but spent only 12.5% of that sum on transit. Georgia and twenty-nine other states restrict the use of the gasoline tax revenue for funding highway programs only. Because Atlanta-area jobs have moved to suburbs, where public transit is minimal, they are virtually inaccessible to non-drivers. Thirty-nine percent of all black households in Atlanta do not have access to cars, and in 2000, only 34% of the region's jobs were within a one-hour public transit ride of low-income urban neighborhoods.

The current federal funding scheme continues to be biased against metropolitan areas. Generally, states spend less than 20 percent of federal transportation funding on transit. Public transit has received roughly \$50 billion since the creation of the Urban Mass Transit Administration over thirty years ago while roadway projects have received over \$205 billion since 1956. From 1998-2003, TEA-21 transportation spending amounted to \$217 billion. This was the "largest public works bill enacted in the nation's history." Although local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure, they receive only about 10 percent of every dollar they generate.

1AC—Racism

Failed Transit Funding in the Status Quo Disables Even State of the Art Transit Systems and Supports Structural Racism—These are Ideas Ingrained in the Very Notion of Transportation in the United States, Federal Funding is Crucial to Reverse these Attitudes

Pasadena Weekly, "Left behind:How and why LA's mass transit system remains separate and unequal," April 26th, 2012 (<http://www.pasadenaweekly.com/cms/story/detail/?id=11175>)

But today, even with all the new, cleaner buses in operation and the county's rail system — lines dubbed with the ostensibly cheery colors Gold, Blue, Red Purple and Green — working at its most efficient levels, those gains over the past 17 years mean little without federal funding to keep the system operating.

"**Transit funding is already in crisis.**" Martinez wrote last fall in an email to local media outlets about a "Don't X Out Public Transportation," rally at the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Vermont Avenue. **Nationally, over 84 percent of transit agencies are already cutting transit lifelines or raising fares despite increases in ridership.** Students, the elderly, swing-shift workers, transit workers and millions of transit riders across the country are seeing their transit lifelines cut. Los Angeles alone has lost almost 1 million hours from bus service in the past three years, leaving thousands stranded."

The gains made by bus riders in LA County, where after decades predominantly working-class people of African-American, Latino and Asian ancestry continue using a system which heavily subsidizes substantially fewer white, affluent (or at least better off) riders, would be severely impaired without federal funding. And with continued federal deprivation of funds constantly being threatened,

"The impacts on LA will be severe, as well as on the entire country's ability to create and sustain jobs, further hampering efforts to stimulate the national economy," Esperanza warned.

It seems a tragic irony: The MTA has been finally forced by a US District Judge, a Special Master, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and ultimately the US Supreme Court, which refused to hear the MTA's final appeal, making the consent decree the "law of the land," to recognize the agency's built-in, or institutional, racism and redistribute public resources toward upgrading and invigorating its improving but still lacking bus system. But now, **without federal assistance, the necessary funding may never be available to pay for new rail systems, let alone fuel and maintain a middle-aged fleet of motor vehicles.**

The law of the land

Racism — overt and institutional — in the administration of public transportation in Southern California **may appear to be anomalous** in the modern world, given the now much more rigorously enforced constitutional protections against overt displays of discrimination by public agencies. It should also help to know that many of the people who sit on the various governing boards of the MTA are women and members of minority classes — like Villaraigosa, LA's first Latino mayor in 130 years — who have risen through the political or bureaucratic ranks. **However, these folks, despite their best intentions, now find themselves in the unenviable social, ethical, political and racial quandaries of carrying out the duties of administering an inherently racist system** and remaining true to ethnic identities and political allegiances.

Villaraigosa is not alone in this respect. In 1998, as Strategy Center leader Eric Mann writes in "Radical Social Movements and the Responsibilities of Progressive Intellectuals," for the Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review, "after the BRU argued that the MTA was reneging on purchasing expansion buses and drivers as part of the agreement, Judge Hatter ordered the MTA to purchase 350 additional buses [at an estimated cost of \$120 million] as well as the requisite drivers [estimated at 700] and the requisite operating funds [estimated at \$70 million per year] to reduce overcrowding to standards agreed upon in the Decree. Despite admonitions from Rev. James Lawson, a longtime colleague of Martin Luther King, that he felt he was addressing an arrogant southern school board in defiance of federal civil rights laws, the MTA voted 12 to 1 to appeal the case. Mayor Richard Riordan and every board member of color — Yvonne [Brathwaite] Burke, Jenny Orapeza, Gloria Molina, Richard Alatorre — voted to appeal a federal court order from a black judge." Burke, a former county supervisor, is black. Molina, a sitting supervisor, is Latina, as was the now-deceased Orapeza, a former state senator who was the first Latina Long Beach City Councilwoman. Alatorre, a former Los Angeles City Councilman, is Latino. Mann, who is white, seems to have forgotten in his analysis Franklin White, CEO of the MTA at the time the subway and light rail projects were first being planned, who is African American.

While this is something of a new twist to an old political dilemma for minority officeholders and bureaucrats moving up political ladders, racism is certainly nothing new in the American public travel experience. Nor are these inequities likely to be completely eliminated as long as the MTA's mission remains one of continual growth and technical innovation and the system's primary customer base continues to be poor and working-poor people, immigrants, the elderly and people of color — all especially vulnerable to the conditions of institutional exploitation that often comes with economic growth.

It is because of these social, political and economic forces that the idea of racially exclusionary transit systems is literally ingrained in the American consciousness. Carriage, train, trolley and bus systems — public and private — routinely discriminated against African Americans, immigrants and poor whites in every state in the nation throughout much of the country's history. Given the fact that many of our attitudes about race and class came to be molded and continue to be influenced by issues originating in the field of mass transit, it's hardly surprising that race and class bias would still be infecting the administration of modern community transportation systems, such as the MTA.

1AC—Racism

Funding for Mass Transit is a Fundamental Civil Rights Issue—Status Quo Design and Operation Ensures that Communities of Color Remain Impoverished and Second Class

Robert D. Bullard is the Ware Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, "WEB SPECIAL: The Anatomy of Transportation Racism," 2004 (<http://urbanhabitat.org/highwayrobbery>)

Martin Luther King, Jr., recognized that racism in its many forms was holding Blacks back economically and that Blacks were being denied the basic rights that white Americans took for granted. In his speeches, he made it clear that the racism being fought in the Montgomery transit system was not an isolated occurrence, but that racism permeated every American institution.

"When you go beyond the relatively simple though serious problems such as police racism, however, you begin to get into all the complexities of the modern American economy. Urban transit systems in most American cities, for example, have become a genuine civil rights issue—and a valid one—because the layout of rapid-transit systems determines the accessibility of jobs to the Black community. If transportation systems in American cities could be laid out so as to provide an opportunity for poor people to get to meaningful employment, then they could begin to move into the mainstream of American life. A good example of this problem is my home city of Atlanta, where the rapid-transit system has been laid out for the convenience of the white upper-middle-class suburbanites who commute to their jobs downtown. The system has virtually no consideration for connecting the poor people with their jobs. There is only one possible explanation for this situation, and that is the racist blindness of city planners."

By linking the unequal treatment on and access to buses with the violation of constitutionally guaranteed civil rights, the MIA and their leaders built on the foundation laid by the United Defense League boycott in Baton Rouge. The Montgomery bus boycott was a turning point for many reasons. It introduced nonviolent direct action to the Black South and demonstrated the collective power of a united Black community. The basic organizing principles that came out of Montgomery were implanted in the nationwide civil rights movement and changed America forever. The Black masses would no longer be treated as second-class citizens, relegated to the back of the bus. They demanded to be treated as Americans.

1AC—Racism**Racism Can Be Dismantled, But Every Step is Key—Challenging Instances of White Privilege are Crucial to Preventing Total Collapse**

Joseph Barndt, Co-director of Ministry Working to Dismantle Racism, "Dismantling Racism," 1991 (p.155)

But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. Brick by brick, stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural racism can be destroyed. You and I are urgently called to joining the effort of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism.

The danger point of self-destruction seems to be drawing even more near. The results of centuries of national and worldwide conquest and colonialism, of military buildups and violent aggression, of overconsumption and environmental destruction may be reaching a point of no return. A small and predominantly white minority of the global population derives its power and privilege from the sufferings of vast majority of peoples of all color. For the sake of the world and ourselves, we dare not allow it to continue.

1AC—Racism

The Apocalypse isn't To Come—For the Vast Majority of the World, Poverty, War, Genocide, Environmental Destruction and Violence are an Everyday Reality, Not the Result of Your Convoluted Disads

Chuck Galli, "Hip-Hop Futurism: Remixing Afrofuturism and the Hermeneutics of Identity" Honors Projects Overview, 2009 (http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects/18.)

Gilroy contends that thinking about the future has a distinctive character in Black traditions and has roots in the material history of many Black peoples. He references the high frequency of Black spirituals based on "deliverance" and postulates that the mind of the Black slave was firmly planted in the future because the present was so hopeless and wretched. To grossly summarize his very brilliant works and arguments, Gilroy proposes that since the Black present has so often provided no impetus to survive or hope of personal and group betterment, the future became a mental and spiritual location for Blacks on the plantation, wherever that may have been.⁵⁴ Gilroy considers himself to be a successor in this theoretical lineage (though obviously not informed by the same lived conditions as slaves and colonial subjects) and admits that when considering issues of race theory, racism, and anti-racism, he prefers to "[invoke] the unknowable future against the unforgiving present."⁵⁵ Gilroy believes that "Corrective or compensatory inclusion in modernity should no longer supply the dominant theme" of anti-racist discourse and says that people should "self-consciously... become more future oriented," drawing his inspiration from Franz Fanon, who advocated that one should know his history, but break from it if he is ever to be free.⁵⁶ In his book *The Black Atlantic*, Gilroy deals with what he sees as a stark ideological differentiation between Western peoples and peoples of the African diaspora regarding their respective eschatologies.⁵⁷ On the one hand, he identifies the theme of a futuristic "utopia" in the Western literary tradition. Western futurism, he claims, operates within a framework of European modernity and holds to the idea that society is progressing through rationalism, and that such progress will lead humans to better lives.⁵⁸ Essentially, in the popular Western tradition, technological advances and material gain are seen as indicators of progress, and such progress can be followed along a rational path (that is, a path which rationalizes the continued perception of increased technological complexity and material gain as measures of advancement) toward a utopia where basic needs are no longer extant thanks to innovation, labor, and the removal from society of things which interfere with progress. Conversely, Gilroy points to a long tradition of "the jubilee" in Black literature and history that is inconsistent with the Western belief in utopia.⁵⁹ If utopia is a state of perfect being achieved through a process of societal progress, jubilee is a process of being perfect regardless of the eventual destination.⁶⁰ Gilroy relates the story of a female slave who fled to a free state with her children before the American Civil War and took refuge in a house. Upon finding her whereabouts, slave hunters surrounded the house with firearms and demanded that the woman and her children come out. Rather than do the "rational" thing and surrender in hopes of receiving less punishment for herself and her children, the woman grabbed a knife and slit the throat of one of her small children, making for the others in hopes of achieving the same ends.⁶¹ For the slave woman, the murder of her children is a jubilant thing, for it defies slavery as a practice and institution, terrorism, White supremacy, and American law. The act of perfect being in the moment supercedes the hope of attaining personal, material betterment. Gilroy credits this phenomenon of the jubilee in Black thought partially to the relationship between Blacks and labor.⁶² As Europe entered the Modern era and individual rights began to (slowly) replace the feudal labor system, Europeans began to see a correlation between their labor, personal progress, societal progress, and the betterment of everything through work.⁶³ Blacks, Gilroy argues, were not infused with the same (some say Protestant) work ethic, tending to associate Modern labor with terror, slavery, colonization, and a diminishing of individual rights. As he succinctly puts it: This inclination towards death and away from bondage is fundamental. It reminds us that in the revolutionary eschatology which helps to define this primal history of modernity, whether apocalyptic or redemptive, it is the moment of jubilee that has the upper hand over the pursuit of utopia by rational means.⁶⁴ The repeated choice of death rather than bondage articulates a principal of negativity that is opposed to the formal logic and rational calculation characteristic of modern western thinking and expressed in the Hegelian slave's preference for bondage rather than death.⁶⁵ This resulted in a vastly different interpretation of the technological, economic, and civil advances created through work. Rather than seeing these European markers of cultural "progress" as proof that work was directly related to a more perfect life, and as a basis for hope that future benefits can be attained through more work, Gilroy argues that Blacks interpreted their work as antithetical to their own interests and perceived as a lie the notion that labor led to advancements, which led to a better life. The modern labor ethic was/is thus seen as Middle Ages feudalism gone through metamorphosis and reemerged with a new selling-point of universality.⁶⁶ Music critic and writer Mark Sinker says that the "central fact" of Afrofuturist art is "that the Apocalypse already happened".⁶⁷ The queue to take this post-apocalyptic position can arguably be drawn from a number of instances in Black history: the abduction of Africans and subsequent transportation to an alien land, the institution of generational slavery and the construction of a legal hell, or even the subjugation of a people to the needs of the Cross-Bronx Expressway and the abandonment of the society which followed. It seems to follow that if Afrofuturist thought has been constructed in a mindset of post-apocalypse, that the concept of the jubilee would very easily come to be a prime futuristic aspiration since the march of modernity led to the apocalypse in the first place. We have, then, arguments that postulate the existence of something which occurs with such frequency in the futuristic imaginings of Blacks that it warrants a prefix such as Afro- or Black- in describing it. I would add this thing to Dery's and Nelson's definitions of *Afrofuturism* – that there is essentially a challenge to the entire European notion (which, thanks to modernity, has practically issued an official, though not de facto, statement of monopoly to the world) that progress is tied to labor and that such progress is necessarily "good." A muted rebuttal has been made for centuries to the grand structure by which humans of various colors and backgrounds have been told to measure goodness – this progress-hermeneutics superstructure. The aim here is to grasp some relatively broad, generally recognized definitions and characteristics of Afrofuturism. We have identified the popular definitions of Mark Dery and Alondra Nelson as well as the concepts of utopia, jubilee, apocalypse, and what I have termed the progress-hermeneutics superstructure. All of these concepts will play a major role in the treatment of my coming proposition that "hip-hop futurism" be considered a unique and important praxis in its own right. For now, however, I will move on to illuminate the many futuristically oriented modes of production in hip-hop which will hopefully lay sufficient groundwork for the introduction and exploration of hip-hop futurism.

1AC—Racism

The Effect of Whiteness Limits Our Ability to Understand or Relate to Violence and the World at Large—We Must Not Only Recognize the Function of White Privilege, But Also Respond With an Affirmation of Political Opposition to the Regime—No Valid Epistemology is Possible Without It

George Yancy, Assoc Professor of Philosophy at Duquesne University, What White Looks Like, 2004 (Google Books)

To what extent does Pecola exist within a "field of possibilities"? Dominated by the value code of whiteness, any other actions on her part are pretty much null and void. She does not seem to possess the capacity to negotiate with history. Hence, Pecola appears limited to a single actuality, the desire to be white. Foucault does admit that "without the possibility of recalcitrance, power would be equivalent to physical determination." "I." He also writes: When an individual or social group succeeds in blocking a field of power relations, immobilizing them and preventing any reversibility of movement by economic, political, or military means, one is faced with what may be called a state of domination. In such a state, it is certain that practices of freedom do not exist or exist only unilaterally or are extremely constrained and limited. **116

What is problematic here is that Foucault does not seem to allow for the possibility of psychological domination. Pecola is dominated by the value code of whiteness, a code that has fissured her psychological "inferiority." As long as she remains a prisoner to this code, Pecola will not be capable of "diverse comportments." Foucault does not provide the conceptual apparatus to effectively explain Pecola's condition. We need a phenomenology of Pecola's pain and suffering that will take us beyond the findings of genealogy. Getting Pecola to "think her own history" is clearly not enough. Genealogy is certainly a powerful tool that enables us to clear space for seeing how things need not have been. In Pecola's case, however, it is not radical enough. Pecola is in need of deep psychological liberation. Although critical of the concept of liberation, Foucault does acknowledge its importance in cases involving colonized people." Again, however, he does not acknowledge the need for specific forms of psychological liberation. Colonization is not simply restricted to a set of actions limiting another set of actions: it tears at the very fabric of one's identity. White colonialism establishes its own ideals. Whiteness establishes its own normalizing "truths" which are designed to shape and epistemologically anchor particular ways of knowing and being. Though it is clear that Foucault would not have a formulaic solution to Pecola's situation, he does speak of new pleasures and new bodies. Perhaps by micropolitically examining Pecola's situation, that is, how she has become captivated by the ruse of whiteness, the answer lies in a "counterattack against the deployment" of whiteness. "8 This counterattack as a form of resistance, however, cannot remain at the level of resistance. Simply to resist the hegemonic regime of whiteness is to remain a prisoner to that regime. More is needed. Pecola must also engage in an act of affirmation. So how do we "liberate" Pecola? There is a need to explore, through sustained psychotherapy, the intricate depths of her psychopathology. Psychotherapy, however, must work in conjunction with political resistance, and political resistance must give way to affirmation. She should be encouraged and reinforced to resist the value code of white-ness that has held her prisoner. She will need to conceptually understand how whiteness functions; she will need to see beyond the curtain of whiteness's deception. After all, when it comes to whiteness, there is no great Oz; rather, there are (white) people and their (white) practices backed by institutional and brute force. Her psychological liberation will begin with her rethinking her own individual psychohistory and the history of blacks of African descent more generally. Through the help of genealogy, perhaps she will be able to find a vocabulary to articulate the emergence of whiteness as a facade of universality. In this way, Pecola will be able to disrupt the power/knowledge nexus of whiteness on her body/self. She will come to understand the extent of destructiveness that the desired object of whiteness has had upon her. This, however, is not simply a conceptual endeavor. She will need to explore new and affirmative ways of emoting, feeling, striving, being. This will be done through the appropriation of a new narrative, a narrative of self-love and self-respect: she will come to narrate her identity within the context of a nonwhite hegemonic narrative, a narrative that accents and valorizes (in nonessentialist terms) the ever historically shifting positive modes of what it means to be black. But what specifically awaits Pecola on the other side of liberation? How will she configure her practices of freedom? Does living her body/self as black create new spaces for living aesthetically and ethically? After all, Foucault will not allow for authentic/inauthentic distinctions in terms of an onto-logically core identity. There simply is no authentic/inauthentic self.

Advantage—No Transit Now**Lack of American Support for Public Transit Encourages Reliance on Fossil Fuels and Air Pollution—We are Massively Lacking NOW**

Huffington Post, "What Ever Happened to Public Transportation?" July 2nd, 2010 (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-robbins/what-ever-happened-to-pub_b_633585.html)

In 2009, National Geographic conducted an annual study measuring and monitoring consumer progress toward environmentally sustainable consumption in seventeen countries around the world. The resulting "Consumer Greendex" found that Americans ranked as the world's least green consumers. Of all the nations surveyed, we have the lowest percentage of people who use public transit on a daily basis. And we have the highest percentage of people who never, ever, take public transit.

How did this happen? Are we Americans that antisocial? I don't think so. But our public policies have had unintended consequences.

The Interstate Highway Act of 1956 produced an enormous network of highways across the United States. The largest public works project in American history to that date, it paid for a vast suburban road infrastructure, making commutes between the suburbs and urban centers much easier and far quicker. In part, the system was justified for reasons of national defense. It provided roads big enough to carry our tanks, in case the Russians invaded.

But it also had several unanticipated results. It furthered the flight of citizens, businesses, and investments from inner cities. It led to huge increases in the population of suburbs and a decline of walkable cities with good public transit systems. It greatly increased the use of petroleum and consequently the amount of air pollution. And it ushered in an auto age in which almost every transportation decision has been oriented around private cars and trucks driving on public highways.

The bias is built into our language. We speak of "investing" in highways and "investing" in freeways and parking spaces. But we "subsidize" trains and buses. Officials criticize bus, rail, and other public transportation alternatives for "losing money." Lost in this language is the fact that public transit is a civic necessity. Buses, railroads, and other forms of public transportation can no more "lose money" than roads and highways.

Today, with the exception of a few of our larger cities, most notably New York, U.S. public transit systems have been profoundly neglected. A third of all mass transit users in the entire United States use the New York City system, which is why New York is the only city in the country where more than half of the households don't own a car. And even New York, widely acknowledged to have the best public transit system in the United States, falls far short compared to systems in Tokyo, Moscow, Taipei, London, Seoul, Paris, Hong Kong, Berlin, and Copenhagen.

Advantage—Transit Key to Community

Mass Transit Forces a Sense of Community that Clashes With the Violent Individualism of Car-Based Transportation

Earth Island Journal, "Why Do Conservatives Hate Public Transit?" April 3rd 2012

(http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/elist/eListRead/why_do_conservatives_hate_public_transit)

If you want a peek into the conservative id to understand Republicans' fears of mass transit, just check out [this piece](#) written last year by Washington Post columnist George Will bashing high-speed rail projects:

"Forever seeking Archimedean levers for prying the world in directions they prefer, progressives say they embrace high-speed rail for many reasons—to improve the climate, increase competitiveness, enhance national security, reduce congestion, and rationalize land use. The length of the list of reasons, and the flimsiness of each, points to this conclusion: the real reason for progressives' passion for trains is their goal of diminishing Americans' individualism in order to make them more amenable to collectivism.

"To progressives, the best thing about railroads is that people riding them are not in automobiles, which are subversive of the deference on which progressivism depends. Automobiles go hither and yon, wherever and whenever the driver desires, without timetables. Automobiles encourage people to think they—unsupervised, untutored, and unscripted—are masters of their fates. The automobile encourages people in delusions of adequacy, which make them resistant to government by experts who know what choices people should make.

"Time was, the progressive cry was 'Workers of the world unite!' or 'Power to the people!' Now it is less resonant: 'All aboard!'"

Most of this is absurd. Progressivism isn't the same as collectivism, and I don't know anyone on the liberal-left who is determined to undercut people's sense of "adequacy."

But Will is, in a way, right: The car encourages people to develop an overinflated sense of autonomy while mass transit illustrates how we are all, in fact, connected to and reliant on each other.

Driving down the open road is the most American expression of freedom. Wrapped in your own little steel carapace, blasting your music, pushing past the speed limit, you can feel like the master of your universe. The delusion of grandeur (to turn Will's phrase on its head) is perfect. Unless you remember that the road you're driving on was built and paid for with taxes. Or until you hit the inevitable traffic jam. (Notice how car commercials always show the new car model on empty streets — a fantasy if there ever was one.)

Riding the train, the subway or the bus is, of course, an entirely different experience. First of all, you have to share space: you can't blast your music and sing along. You have to — yes, gasp — show deference (Will's word) to other people. Maybe that's annoying. But it's also the basis of civilization, learning to get along with other people.

This doesn't "diminish individualism." But public transit does show the power — the necessity, even — of individuals working together. Mass transit requires many people working together to make it work. The rubbing of elbows and the sharing of seats proves that we're all connected. Public transit, you could say, is human ecology at its best.

Public transit shows that we're all in this together. And for many Republicans — who seem bent on taking us back to a Hobbesian war-of-all-against-all — that's reason enough to oppose it.

Advantage—Transit Key to Quality of Life**Transportation is a Crucial Aspect of All Life and Crucial to Overall Quality of Life—Transit Racism is Fundamentally Important**

Robert Bullard, Prof of Law at San Francisco School of Law, "Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States," Fordham Urban Law Journal, 2003 (<http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2193&context=ulj>)

In the United States, all communities do not receive the same benefits from transportation advancements and investments.' Despite the heroic efforts and the monumental social and economic gains made over the decades, transportation remains a civil rights issue.' Transportation touches every aspect of where we live, work, play, and go to school, as well as the physical and natural world. Transportation also plays a pivotal role in shaping human interaction, economic mobility, and sustainability.³ Transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring access to education, health care, and other public services.' Transportation equity is consistent with the goals of the larger civil rights movement and the environmental justice movement.⁵ For millions, transportation is defined as a basic right.⁶ Transportation is basic to many other quality of life indicators such as health, education, employment, economic development, access to municipal services, residential mobility, and environmental quality.⁷ The continued residential segregation of people of color away from suburban job centers (where public transit is inadequate or nonexistent) may signal a new urban crisis and a new form of "residential apartheid."⁸ Transportation investments, enhancements, and financial resources have provided advantages for some communities, while at the same time, other communities have been disadvantaged by transportation decision making.⁹

Advantage—Transit Funding is Anti-Metro**Mass Transit Funding is Fundamentally Skewed Against Metropolitan Areas**

Robert Bullard, Prof of Law at San Francisco School of Law, "Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States," Fordham Urban Law Journal, 2003 (<http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2193&context=ulj>)

Generally, states spend less than 20% of federal transportation funding on transit.³⁴ The current federal funding scheme is bias against metropolitan areas. The federal government allocated the bulk of transportation dollars directly to state departments of transportation. ³⁶ Many of the road-building fiefdoms are no friend to urban transit. Just under 6% of all federal highway dollars are sub-allocated directly to the metropolitan regions.³⁷ Moreover, thirty states restrict use of the gasoline tax revenue to fund highway programs only.³⁸ Although local governments within metropolitan areas own and maintain the vast majority of the transportation infrastructure, they receive only about 10% of every dollar they generate.³⁹

Advantage—Transit Funding Key to the Economy**Mass Transit Creates Jobs and Serves Economic Needs—Especially Helps Non-White Communities**

Applied Research Center, "Filling the Gaps," March 2010 (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/28860405/Filling-the-Gaps-COMMUTE-and-the-Fight-for-Transit-Equity-in-New-York-City>)

More-recent processes of urban development and gentrification have pushed people of color out of transit-rich urban centers and into New York City's periphery where rent is relatively more affordable and public transit is less available. Because New Yorkers of color are much less likely to drive as compared to white residents, the existing highway infrastructures that pass through these neighborhoods do not serve the mobility needs of those who live there. Meanwhile, though the federal government invests disproportionately in highways, the development of public transportation such as trains and buses actually creates more jobs than car-oriented transportation development. Research shows that every billion dollars of stimulus money spent on mass transit creates about 20,000 jobs months as opposed to about 10,000 job months created through highway infrastructure spending. In the current jobs crisis, investment in jobs is particularly essential, especially for people of color who consistently face higher levels of unemployment. In the final quarter of 2009, unemployment in New York City was at about 16 percent for Blacks and at about 12 percent for Latinos, compared to just over 7 percent for whites.

Advantage—Transit Funding Leads to Sprawl

Failure to Promote Transit Funding Leads to Suburban Sprawl that Damages Quality of Life, Especially for People of Color

Robert Bullard, Prof of Law at San Francisco School of Law, "Addressing Urban Transportation Equity in the United States," Fordham Urban Law Journal, 2003 (<http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2193&context=ulj>)

In *Sprawl City: Race, Politics and Planning in Atlanta*, the authors documented that government-subsidized sprawl has substantial social equity, civil rights, and health implications. Suburban sprawl is fueled by the "iron triangle" of finance, land use planning, and transportation service delivery. Sprawl-fueled growth is widening the gap between the "haves" and "have-nots." Suburban sprawl has clear social and environmental effects. The social effects of suburban sprawl include concentration of urban core poverty, closed opportunity, limited mobility, economic disinvestment, social isolation, and urban/suburban disparities that closely mirror racial inequities. The environmental effects of suburban sprawl include urban infrastructure decline, increased energy consumption, automobile dependency, threats to public health and the environment, including air pollution, flooding, and climate change, and threats to farm land and wildlife habitat. Many jobs have shifted to the suburbs and communities where public transportation is inadequate or nonexistent. The exodus of low-skilled jobs to the suburbs disproportionately affects central-city residents, particularly people of color, who often face more limited choice of housing location and transportation in growing areas. Between 1990 and 1997, jobs on the fringe of metropolitan areas grew by 19% versus 4% job growth in core areas. While many new jobs are being created in the suburbs, the majority of job opportunities for low-income workers are still located in central cities.

Advantage—Transit Funding Racist**Failing Public Transit Encourages Racial Separation and Apartheid—These Funding Decisions are Fundamentally Racist**

Environmental Justice Resource Center, "Suburban Sprawl and Transportation Racism," The Black Commentator, September 23rd, 2004 (http://www.blackcommentator.com/106/106_transportation_racism.html)

Inadequate public transit services in many of the nation's metropolitan regions, which have high proportions of "captive" transit dependents, has exacerbated social, economic, and racial isolation and aided in institutionalizing transportation apartheid. Today, no other group is more physically isolated from jobs than African Americans. Suburbs are increasing their share of office space, while central cities see their share declining. In 2000, the "spatial mismatch" between jobs and residence meant that more than 50 percent of the nation's blacks would have to relocate to achieve an even distribution of blacks relative to jobs; the comparable figures for whites are 20 to 24 percentage points lower. The suburban share of the metropolitan office space is 69.5 percent in Detroit, 65.8 percent in Atlanta, 57.7 percent in Washington, DC, 57.4 percent in Miami, and 55.2 percent in Philadelphia. Getting to these suburban jobs without a car is next to impossible. It is no accident that Detroit leads in suburban "office sprawl." Detroit is also the most segregated big city in the United States and the only major metropolitan area without a regional transit system. Only about 2.4 percent of metropolitan Detroiters use transit to get to work.

From New York to California, and a host of cities in between, people of color and poor people are challenging unfair, unjust, and illegal transportation policies and practices that relegate them to the back of the bus. Transportation provides access to opportunity and serves as a key component in addressing poverty, unemployment, and equal opportunity goals while ensuring access to education, health care, and other public services.

Advantage—Transit Funding Racist

Transit Related Racism is Still Overwhelming—Communities of Color Suffer Most From the Negative Affects of Failed Transit and the Accompanying Segregation

Applied Research Center, "Filling the Gaps," March 2010 (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/28860405/Filling-the-Gaps-COMMUTE-and-the-Fight-for-Transit-Equity-in-New-York-City>)

Despite the removal of formal barriers to equal access to buses, the end of Jim Crow and an emergent awareness about racial profiling, communities of color are still disadvantaged by transit racism. Increasingly, this transit racism is insidious and silent. It emerges out of structural deficiencies and generations of racial discrimination in urban development, rather than from legal intent or individual bias. It foments deep inequities and erects massive barriers to opportunity for those who live in neighborhoods of color. About 80 percent of the funding from the Federal Surface Transportation Act (FSTA) is allocated to highways and other car-oriented transportation, while just 20 percent is dedicated to public transit. People of color are more likely than whites to rely on public transportation. Because such a small percentage of federal dollars is invested in public transit, the burden of funding transportation rests disproportionately on those who ride buses and trains as opposed to drivers, despite the fact that drivers in the region are a higher-income demographic. The current funding model for transportation in New York leaves public transit riders paying 55 percent of the cost of their ride through the fares rather than through other revenue models. This is the highest rate of anywhere in the country. Communities of color suffer most from the damaging effects of greenhouse gas emissions. "In communities of color, especially when you're dealing with environmental justice issues, we're already impacted by far too many burdens," says Terrell. "We're impacted by far too many sources of pollution, and then you have to deal with another burden where you can't even get around. There are a lot of people who don't even have the opportunity to leave their neighborhood other than the public transportation that we have. So it's a very, very serious issue."

Advantage—Transit Funding Racist**Failures of Transit Now Create Segregated Communities and Encourages Social Inequality**

Blakeley City Talk, "[National Transport Dilemmas + Opportunities](http://www.blakelycitytalk.com/national-transportation/)," December 20th, 2010

(<http://www.blakelycitytalk.com/national-transportation/>)

Studies of urban form suggest that depending upon the spatial structures of urban opportunities and the available transportation systems, patterns of accessibility barriers in particular urban areas may exist. In metropolitan landscapes in the United States, patterns and processes of urban sprawl dominate. Growing at the edges of central cities, sprawl is characterized as scattered low-density residential, commercial, and retail development, with poor accessibility (Ewing, 1994). With urban sprawl has come the decentralization of industrial and manufacturing employment into the metropolitan periphery (Kasarda, 1989) and the disparate concentrations of retail, commercial, and high-skilled and service-sector jobs in metropolitan edge cities (Garreau, 1991). This polycentric or dispersed urban spatial structure (Giuliano and Small, 1991) has created metropolitan landscapes of social inequality and social polarization (Levine, 2000; Squires, 2002). Specifically, with the outward growth of scattered low-density development of opportunities in the suburbs, individuals throughout the United States have become increasingly dependent upon the private automobile (Newman and Kenworthy, 1999) to reach suburban destinations of opportunity, especially employment.

This growing dependence upon automobiles creates geographies of social inequities and polarization in metropolitan areas along socioeconomic lines. Racial minorities and the poor are disproportionately reliant upon inefficient public transportation systems that provide limited spatial and temporal service (Fielding, 1995; Pucher and Renne, 2003; Pucher, 2004). In many sprawling cities in the United States, the large employment markets in the metropolitan periphery remain inaccessible via public transportation, leaving large populations of central-city residents without employment. These transportation-based barriers to employment led to the formation of urban ghettos or inner cities (Harvey, 1973), resulted in social isolation (Wilson, 1987) and concentrations of poverty among African Americans (powell, 2002) in metropolitan urban core areas.

Advantage—Racism Impacts (Morality/Violence)**Racism Challenges the Very Foundation of Social Order—Absent Our Moral and Ethical Dedication Against Racism Violence and Exclusion are Inevitable**

Albert Memmi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, (p. 165)

However, it remains true that one's moral conduct only emerges from a choice; one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is "the truly capital sin."²² It is not an accident that almost all of humanity's spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death.

Advantage—Racism Impacts (Nuclear War)**Racism is a Megacrisis on Par With Nuclear War and Violence—Society Has No Value Without Ethical Values**

Brij Mohan, Dean Emeritus. School of Social Work, Louisiana State University, Eclipse of Freedom, 1993 (p. 3-4)

Metaphors of existence symbolize variegated aspects of the human reality. However, words can be apocalyptic. "There are words," de Beauvoir writes, "as murderous as gas chambers" (1968: 30). Expressions can be unifying and explosive; they portray explicit messages and implicit agendas in human affairs and social configurations. Manifestly the Cold War is over. But the world is not without nuclear terror. Ethnic strife and political instabilities in the New World Order -- following the dissolution of the Soviet Union -- have generated fears of nuclear terrorism and blackmail in view of the widening circle of nuclear powers. Despite encouraging trends in nuclear disarmament, unsettling questions, power, and fear of terrorism continue to characterize the crisis of the new age which is stumbling at the threshold of the twenty-first century. The ordeal of existence transcends the thermonuclear fever because the latter does not directly impact the day-to-day operations of the common people. The fear of crime, accidents, loss of job, and health care on one hand; and the sources of racism, sexism, and ageism on the other hand have created a counterculture of denial and disbelief that has shattered the façade of civility. Civilization loses its significance when its social institutions become counterproductive. It is this aspect of the mega-crisis that we are concerned about.

Advantage—Racism Impacts (Biopower/War)**Racism is a Form of Biopolitical Authority—It Mobilizes Populations to War and Violence**

Eduardo Mendieta, Professor of Philosophy at SUNY Stony Brook, “‘To Make Live and to Let Die’—Foucault on Racism,” Meeting of the Foucault Circle, APA Central Division Meeting, Chicago IL, April 25, 2002

(www.sunysb.edu/philosophy/faculty/emendieta/articles/foucault.pdf)

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism” (Foucault 1997, 227). To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperial colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture. As I wrote somewhere else, racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other, of others, an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

Advantage—Racism Impacts (Deontic)**Regardless of Consequences, Racism Must Be Avoided at All Costs—It is a Deontic Harm**

Robert C. Post, Professor of Law at Berkeley, William & Mary Law Review, Winter 1991 (lexis)

A recurring theme in the contemporary literature is that racist expression ought to be regulated because it creates what has been termed "deontic" harm. 18 The basic point is that there is an "elemental wrongness" 19 to racist expression, regardless of the presence or absence of particular empirical consequences such as "grievous, severe psychological injury." 20 It is argued that toleration for racist expression is inconsistent with respect for "the principle of equality" 21 that is at the heart of the fourteenth amendment. 22 The thrust of this argument is that a society committed to ideals of social and political equality cannot remain passive: it must issue unequivocal expressions of solidarity with vulnerable minority groups and make positive statements affirming its commitment to those ideals.

Advantage—Racism Impacts (Ethics/Violence)**Racism is Fundamentally Immoral and Unethical—It Must Be Rejected in Every Instance—The Failure to Challenge Racial Injustice is The Foundation for all Oppression and Violence**

Albert Memmi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, (p. 165)

Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. "Recall," says the Bible, "that you were once a stranger in Egypt," which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal -- indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice, a just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

Solvency—Federal Funding Key

Lack of Federal Funding for Transit Infrastructure Results in Declining Services and Increased Fares—Only Centralized Support Can Provide Access to Those Most In Need

Colin F. Peppard, Transportation Policy Advocate, Natural Resources Defense Council, "[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](#)" National Journal Transportation Blog, June 4th, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fund-mass-transit-operating-expenses/>)

While the immediate impacts of any one transit system may be most apparent locally and regionally, these benefits support progress on areas of clear national interest. With this in mind, it's time to make transit operations eligible for broader federal support as part of a shift to a more goal-oriented, performance-focused federal transportation investment program.

A recently released Environmental Defense Fund report, [Reinventing Transit](#), shows that transit is becoming a vital transportation option for a growing cross-section of America. Innovative policymakers and transit operators are extending transit access to more and more households, whether in [rural](#), [suburban](#), or [urban](#) communities, while also using innovative tools to make transit operations more efficient. [Record transit ridership growth](#) over the past few years shows that American families are responding enthusiastically to these new, affordable transportation options that enhance their lives by making their communities more livable. Finally, the clear national imperative to enhance our energy security and reduce climate change dictates that more Americans must have access to efficient, convenient, and reliable transit service.

However, only in limited cases can local transit agencies now receive federal assistance for operating expenses under current programs outside of small urban and rural areas. In recent months, an overwhelming number of transit agencies around the country have [raised fares and cut transit services](#) to close budget gaps caused by the flagging economy. Especially in a tough economy, we should strive to ensure that the employees who provide America's transit service have a job, and do that job productively, so they can continue to provide working families with one of the most affordable transportation options.

Solvency—Federal Support Key

Transit Funding is in the National Interest—Federal Support for Transit is Crucial to Successful Operation

Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr., executive director/CEO of the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and treasurer of the National Association of City Transportation Officials, “[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php)” National Journal Transportation Blog, June 4th, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php>)

While we are considering every possible alternative within our control to close this gap, it is time for the federal government to reengage in its support for transit operations. Dedicated transit operations funding would directly contribute to helping us achieve the nation's energy goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reinforce the federal investment in public transportation infrastructure made under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009.

While transit service is primarily provided locally in communities across the country, effective, reliable public transit service is fundamentally in the federal interest. This role stems from the direct interest in maintaining mobility in the nation's metropolitan areas—a connection of cities, suburbs and counties which are the home to eight in 10 Americans and their jobs. All 50 states contain these critical metropolitan areas which are the economic engines of the country and the 100 largest of these metro areas alone generate 75 percent of the nation's gross domestic product and notably, represent 95% of public transit passenger miles. (source: Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program). Investment in infrastructure, including the building and operating of public transportation systems is critical to ensure the on-going and future prosperity of these metro areas and thus, the Nation.

As we head into reauthorization of federal surface transportation law, now is time to put transit operations back in the equation.

AT: Transit Trades-off With Highways**Removing Transit Funding Doesn't Solve Highway Issues**

Rep. Earl Blumenauer, Member, House Ways And Means Committee, "Consequences of the Worst Bill Ever," National Journal Transportation Blog, February 15th, 2012 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/transit-walkers-bikers-up-in-a.php>)

Instead of dealing meaningfully with the long term resource problem, Republicans would instead strip out the 20% of the Highway Trust Fund that is dedicated to mass transit projects and use those resources to make up the revenue shortfall for highways. Since this still leaves a large funding gap, they would further reduce the cost of the Highway program by removing programs like Transportation Enhancements and CMAC from the federal highway program. These program would then be forced to compete with transit for a much smaller revenue pool.

Even after shifting these effective programs and popular programs, first authorized by ISTEA in 1991, and raiding all the funding previously allocated to fund transit, the Highway Trust Fund would still show a \$4.9 billion shortfall. But more significant than this immediate shortfall is what's going to happen in the long term. The shortfall is doomed to grow ever larger because the current revenue stream based on fuel consumption will never keep pace with the demands of wear and tear on the system, to say nothing of the program increases needed for growth and expansion.

Increased fuel efficiency and inflation have reduced the per-mile cost that motorists pay by 50% since 1993. With the increasing use of hyper-efficient diesel trucks, hybrid cars, plug-in hybrids, and electric cars, that deficit is only going to grow worse. Not only is this bill not a long term solution, it makes a long term solution more difficult.

AT: States**Federal Funding is Critical to the Stability, Longevity and Effectiveness of Mass Transit**

Laura Barrett, Executive Director, Transportation Equity Network, "Radical Cuts Hurt the Recovery," February 13th, 2012 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/transit-walkers-bikers-up-in-a.php>)

Look no farther for true radicalism. It's right there in the House Transportation and Infrastructure's "solution" to the funding woes of the transportation trust fund. The traditional funding split in the highway trust that has existed for ages - 80 for roads and 20 for transit - is booted. Transit would lose all dedicated funding. The 35 million (and growing) number of people who ride transit every day? They have to just hope that the federal government will feel like voluntarily handing over money every year. All predictability mass transit funding would be gone if the T and I committee gets its way.

That's no way to run a business - especially one as complicated and diverse and crucial as our mass transit systems. We need predictability in the system itself so that all of the businesses which in turn rely on mass transit for their workers can have a dependable workforce. Low income workers who are depending on buses in Detroit, San Diego, Pittsburgh and Milwaukee need to be able to get to work, school, and worship in an affordable manner. Transit riders and their employers need to know they will be able to arrive on time. We have built a mass transit system that is inadequate to our needs. Now, instead of investing in it, the House transportation bill would cut it through benign neglect. The "drown it in the bathtub" ideal is a foolish flight of fancy and should not dictate solutions to thoughtful policy-makers. Let's drown the idea of cutting mass transit, walking, and biking programs instead. We need to go back to the drawing board to find a reasonable, logical way out of the transportation funding crisis.

AT: Won't Ride It

Empirically Increasing Transit Infrastructure Increases Ridership

Michael Lewyn, Associate Professor, John Marshall Law School, "Campaign of Sabotage: Big Government's War Against Public Transportation," Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, 2001

(http://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1439&context=scholarlyworks&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fhl%3Den%26q%3D%2522public%2Btransportation%2522%2Bracism%26btnG%3DSearch%26as_sdt%3D0%252C24%26as_ylo%3D%26as_vis%3D0#search=%22public%20transportation%20racism%22)

It could be argued that no matter what government does to encourage transit use, the inherent advantages of autos make any attempt to increase transit patronage futile. Even transit supporters sometimes fall victim to fatalism: one pro-transit commentator complains that "[t]he popularity of the automobile has long been the bane of urban planners who wish to increase transit ridership [because of the public] preference for the convenience and freedom that the automobile represents.'¹⁷ The facts prove otherwise. If people have enough transportation options and density is high enough to make transit efficient, most people will use it. For example, seventy-four percent of commuters to New York's central business district use public transit to get to work, as opposed to 1.8% of commuters to Orlando's business district. ⁷⁶ Surely New Yorkers and Floridians desire "freedom and convenience" equally, but in New York, government evidently does less to make transit inconvenient.'⁷⁷ Even in suburbia, transit can be an option. For example, in Rosslyn, one of Washington, D.C.'s suburban employment centers,⁷⁸ 20.1% of employees use transit to get to work,' ⁷⁹ more than in the central business districts of many major cities.' ° Transit-oriented employment centers such as Rosslyn and Manhattan have survived eighty years of government hostility to public transit: if government stopped sabotaging public transit, these centers might be even more transit-friendly. Government can increase transit use if it stops sabotaging areas already serviced by transit,'⁸ and eliminates zoning laws that make transit inefficient by artificially reducing suburban population density.⁸² Even if the state and federal governments do not increase transit funding by one cent, they can increase transit service and give Americans more transportation choices if they take a few actions.

AT: Its Not Explicitly Racist**We Must See Racism as the Structural Decision for Whiteness That it Truly Is—Focusing Only on “Explicit” Racism Makes Violence Impossible to Challenge**

Michael K. Brown, Professor, Politics, UC-Santa Cruz, Martin Carnoy, Professor, Education and Economics, Stanford University, Elliott Currie, Lecturer, Legal Studies, UC-Berkeley, Troy Duster, Professor, Sociology, New York University, David B. Oppenheimer, Professor, Law, Golden Gate University, Marjorie Schultz, Professor, Law, UC-Berkeley and Davis Wellman, Professor, Communication Studies, UC-Santa Cruz, WHITEWASHING RACE: THE MYTH OF A COLORBLIND SOCIETY, 2003, p. 55-56.

Arguments that demonize racism and treat it as the exception lose sight of the complicated and subtle workings of being white in America. A focus on obvious bigotry, crude verbal performance, and political practices may make American “nonracists” feel better about themselves. But it also produces a false sense of security. Because it ignores culturally acceptable sophisticated forms of racism, this perspective is unable to detect the “nonracist” ways that being white works to the advantage of European Americans. Opponents of policies that undermine white people’s privileges do not use Klan ideology to justify their opposition. Instead, they invoke the principles of American political beliefs. Not everyone who opposes color-conscious policies does so with the intention of defending white privilege. But one cannot assume, as all too many critics of color-conscious policies do, that opposition to affirmative action is based entirely on the principles of fair play and individual merit. Much of the opposition is based on resentment toward blacks, and this resentment is driven by a fear (conscious or not) that the interests of whites as a group are jeopardized by color-conscious policies. 98 Because colorblind policies are cast as a defense of individualism, the group interests at stake are concealed. But this move poses a more insidious problem than the raw racism of bigots. People voicing virulent antiblack sentiments are an easy target, but restricting racism to them leaves the institutionalized benefits of being white invisible and untouched.

AT: Its “Anti-Metro” Not Racist**Anti-Metro Bias is Fundamentally Racist—It is Not a Coincidence that the Fewest Resources are Dedicated to the Communities With the Fewest White People**

Robert D. Bullard, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, “All Transit Is Not Created Equal,” Urban Habitat, Winter 2005 (<http://urbanhabitat.org/node/306>)

In 2000, population in the U.S. was 69 percent European American, 12 percent African American, 12.5 percent Hispanic, and 3.6 percent Asian American. In the nation's 100 largest cities, people of color comprise nearly half of the population. In the major metropolitan areas where most African Americans, Latinos, and Asians live, segregation levels changed little between 1990 and 2000. Black-White segregation is still significantly higher than segregation levels for other ethnic groups. The average white American lived in a neighborhood that was 80 percent white, eight percent Hispanic, seven percent Black, and four percent Asian. Similarly, the typical African American lived in a neighborhood that was 51 percent Black, 33 percent white, 12 percent Hispanic, and three percent Asian.[6]

Three-fifths of all Blacks live in ten states—New York, California, Texas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, North Carolina, Maryland, Michigan, and Louisiana—and nearly 55 percent of them live in the South. The Northeast and Midwest each had 19 percent of the Black population in 2000, and the West had about 10 percent. Over 88 percent of Blacks live in metropolitan areas and 53.1 percent live inside central cities.

For the nation's 36.4 million African Americans,[7] race clearly underlies and intersects with other factors in explaining the socio-spatial layout of most of our cities, suburbs, and metropolitan regions, and a host of other quality-of-life indicators, such as the location of job centers, housing patterns and land use, the quality of air, transportation, and schools, streets and highway configuration, commercial and business development, and access to health care.

AT: We Fixed Racism

Funding for Highways Rather than Transit Encourages Massive Segregation Which Overwhelms Legal Gains on Race Relations

Transportation Nation, "Back of the Bus: Mass transit, race and inequality," 2010

(<http://transportationnation.org/backofthebus/>)

It's a struggle that stretches far back. In 1896, a case over segregated rail cars made it to the U.S. Supreme Court Case. It was that case – [Plessy v. Ferguson](#) – that legalized the infamous concept of "separate but equal."

It would take more than half a century for the legal precept to be overturned in the 1954 case, [Brown v. Board of Education](#). But while the civil rights movement was playing out at schools, colleges, lunch counters and voting booths, a seemingly unrelated move by the federal government would change the way blacks and whites lived together for the next half century. In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower signed legislation that funded the interstate highway system. It was a seemingly unconnected event, but one that had enormous ramifications.

"At the same time we were doing Brown v. Board of Education and trying to integrate the school system," says Angela Glover Blackwell, the head of [PolicyLink](#), "we were investing billions of dollars in a highway system that segregated the nation by allowing people to be able to run away from urban areas that were integrated to suburban areas that were all white."

One of the communities that was destroyed was the [Rondo neighborhood](#) in St. Paul, Minnesota. Before the highway tore through that neighborhood, Rondo Avenue was a bustling commercial thoroughfare, chock-a-block with barber shops, churches, and shoe stores.

But in 1956, crews began leveling houses on Rondo Avenue to make way for Interstate 94. Nathaniel Khaliq was 13 years old then.

"There were cop cars everywhere," he recalls, "And when I walked into the house, these guys had axes and sledgehammers. They were knocking holes in the walls, breaking the windows, tearing up the plumbing – you know, just to make sure he didn't try to move back in there. I was crying because it looked like something bad was happening."

Ora Lee Patterson also grew up in Rondo. "To own your own home after you couldn't vote, you weren't considered as a human being – and then to see what happened with the freeway, and when they came through and gave them nickels and dimes for their property? They never gave those people what their houses were worth. Never."

It was, Patterson and Khaliq's families were assured, just good urban planning. But Marvin Anderson, a retired attorney and law librarian, spent years searching for evidence the government purposely selected the site of the freeway for all the wrong reasons. In 1993, he unearthed a letter to the editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The writer, a city engineer, Claude Thompson, admitted the government chose the route for I-94 because it was in the city's low-income black neighborhood. Following the mass exodus of the middle class to American suburbs, cities experienced a gradual deterioration of schools and increasing poverty. Even today, transportation funding continues to help the suburbs at the expense of cities. Eighty percent of all transportation dollars are spent on roads. The remaining 20 percent is spent on mass transit.

AT: Black White Dichotomy Bad**Conservative Focus on Black-White Racial Dynamics Necessitates Our Focus on Black-White Racism to Adequately Respond**

Michael K. Brown, Professor, Politics, UC-Santa Cruz, Martin Carnoy, Professor, Education and Economics, Stanford University, Elliott Currie, Lecturer, Legal Studies, UC-Berkeley, Troy Duster, Professor, Sociology, New York University, David B. Oppenheimer, Professor, Law, Golden Gate University, Marjorie Schultz, Professor, Law, UC-Berkeley and Davis Wellman, Professor, Communication Studies, UC-Santa Cruz, WHITEWASHING RACE: THE MYTH OF A COLORBLIND SOCIETY, 2003, p. x.

So why do we focus largely on black and white? We do so because the conservative consensus on race is mostly constructed around the relationship between black and white. Thus, if we are to seriously engage and scrutinize this development, we need to address the issues it raises. This means that while we have introduced materials on Asians and Latinos in those instances where they figure in the new consensus, we have largely restricted ourselves to addressing discrimination practiced by whites against blacks. We found it quite striking that when Asians and Latinos enter the conservative consensus, it is usually to discount the impact of racism on the life-chances of blacks. Thus, Asians are presented as a "model minority" in relation to blacks, and married Latino mothers are used to prove that the reason so many black women are on welfare is because they are single.

AT: Black White Dichotomy Bad**Our Focus is Not on Black-White But on the Function of Whiteness—The Basic Form of Whiteness Distinguishes Itself From the Black to Create the Dichotomy in the First Place**

Michael K. Brown, Professor, Politics, UC-Santa Cruz, Martin Carnoy, Professor, Education and Economics, Stanford University, Elliott Currie, Lecturer, Legal Studies, UC-Berkeley, Troy Duster, Professor, Sociology, New York University, David B. Oppenheimer, Professor, Law, Golden Gate University, Marjorie Schultz, Professor, Law, UC-Berkeley and Davis Wellman, Professor, Communication Studies, UC-Santa Cruz, WHITEWASHING RACE: THE MYTH OF A COLORBLIND SOCIETY, 2003, p. x.

There is another reason we focus on black and white even though we know that today race in America is not dichotomous. It is because the black/white binary persists as a feature of everyday life and is crucial to the commonsense understanding of racism. It persists, in large part, because "whiteness" has always been important in defining who is and who is not an American. The original legislation that specified who could become a naturalized American was unequivocal: naturalization was restricted to white males. To further complicate matters, whiteness in the United States has never been simply a matter of skin color. Being white is also a measure, as Lani Guinier and Gerald Torres put it, "of one's social distance from blackness." ¹ In other words, whiteness in America has been ideologically constructed mostly to mean "not black."

AT: Race Neutrality**We Cannot Ignore the Influence of Race on Social Policy and Funding Decisions—Race Neutrality Fundamentally Fails to Address Inequality**

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p. 221)

Just as Wilson confused the ever-changing nature of U.S. racism with what he deemed "the declining significance of race," he is also wrong in his advocacy of racism-blind poverty policies to address the high rates of African-American urban poverty. Neither the "disappearance" of work in racially segregated neighborhoods or its consequences are "race neutral." 17 Moreover, it is most improbable that the so-called "race-neutral programs" that Wilson advocates would, indeed, be race neutral in a society where virtually every significant social structure is highly racialized. 18 Racism-blind public policies are often offered in the name of being politically practical. That is, it is claimed that racism-focused programs cannot work, politically. All too often in social science policy-related research such political choices are treated as value-neutral social science. Career benefits like large research grants and being included as a part of the public policy mainstream are most likely to accrue to those who locate themselves within the center of existing political discourse, even if such discourse is fundamentally racist and in other ways inhumane in its basic assumptions and outcomes. Color-blind economic justice strategies can work only in color-blind societies. There is no evidence that the United States is color-blind or will be so in the foreseeable future. Color blindness in a highly racialized society—a society which is structured around "race"—is, rather, racism blindness. Racism blindness is an increasingly essential ingredient in the ideological glue that holds such societies together. Racism blindness not only ignores the powerful impact that systemic white racism has on determining who is poor in the United States, but damages all poor people by helping to shape this nation's response to poverty. 19 Conceptually, welfare and other poverty-focused policies and programs may be placed along a continuum based on their response to systemic white racism. This continuum ranges from racism-based action to racism-blind inaction, to racism-cognizant acknowledgment of the existence of racism, to prevention-focused racism-sensitive safeguards, to racism-targeted interventions. 20

AT: Disads

The Future is Not Pre-Determined—The Decisions We Make Determine the Future We Will Found, We Must Understand the Decision to Act or Not-Act as Fundamentally Political

Jose Munoz, Duke University Press Editor, "CRUISING THE TOILET LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, Radical Black Traditions, and Queer Futurity", *Queers Futurity*, 2010 (Ebsco)

The question of children hangs heavily when one considers Baraka's present. On August 12, 2003, one of his daughters, Shani Baraka, and her female lover, Rayshon Holmes, were killed by the estranged husband of Wanda Pasha, who is also one of Baraka's daughters. The thirty-one- and thirty-year-old women's murders were preceded a few months earlier by another hate crime in Newark, the killing of fifteen-year-old Sakia Gunn. Gunn was a black transgendered youth who traveled from Hoboken to Greenwich Village and the Christopher Street piers to hang out with other young queers of color. Baraka and his wife, Amina, have in part dealt with the tragic loss of their daughter by turning to activism. The violent fate of their child has alerted them to the systemic violence that faces queer people (and especially young people) of color. The Barakas have both become ardent antiviolence activists speaking out directly on LGBT issues. Real violence has ironically brought Baraka back to a queer world that he had renounced so many years ago. Through his tremendous loss he has decided to further diversify his consistent commitment to activism and social justice to include what can only be understood as queer politics. In the world of *The Toilet* there are no hate crimes, no lexicon that identifies homophobia per se, but there is the fact of an aggression constantly on the verge of brutal actualization. The mimetic violence resonates across time and to the scene of the loss that the author will endure decades later. This story from real life is not meant to serve as the proof for my argument. Indeed, the play's highly homoerotic violence is in crucial ways nothing like the misogynist violence against women that befell the dramatist's family or the transgenderphobic violence that ended Gunn's young life. I mention these tragedies because it makes one simple point. The future is only the stuff of some kids. Racialized kids, queer kids, are not the sovereign princes of futurity. While Edelman does indicate that the future of the child as futurity is different from the future of actual children, his framing nonetheless accepts and reproduces this monolithic figure of the child that is indeed always already white. He all but ignores the point that other modes of particularity within the social are constitutive of subjecthood beyond the kind of jouissance that refuses both narratological meaning and what he understands as the fantasy of futurity. He anticipates and bristles against his future critics with a precognitive paranoia in footnote 19 of his first chapter. He rightly predicts that some identitarian critics (I suppose that would be me in this instance, despite my ambivalent relation to the concept of identity) would dismiss his polemic by saying it is determined by his middle-class white gay male positionality. This attempt to inoculate himself from those who engage his polemic does not do the job. In the final analysis, white gay male crypto-identity politics (the restaging of whiteness as universal norm via the imaginary negation of all other identities that position themselves as not white) is beside the point. The deeper point is indeed "political," as, but certainly not more, political as Edelman's argument. It is important not to hand over futurity to normative white reproductive futurity. That dominant mode of futurity is indeed "winning," but that is all the more reason to call on a utopian political imagination that will enable us to glimpse another time and place: a "not-yet" where queer youths of color actually get to grow up. Utopian and willfully idealistic practices of thought are in order if we are to resist the perils of heteronormative pragmatism and Anglo-normative pessimism. Imagining a queer subject who is abstracted from the sensuous intersectionalities that mark our experience is an ineffectual way out. Such an escape via singularity is a ticket whose price most cannot afford. The way to deal with the asymmetries and violent frenzies that mark the present is not to forget the future. The here and now is simply not enough. Queerness should and could be about a desire for another way of being in both the world and time, a desire that resists mandates to accept that which is not enough.

AT: Politics

The Attempt to Avoid White Backlash Against Anti-Racist Policy Making Fundamentally Sustains the Liberal Ideology that Enables Racist Violence

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p. 220-221)

Since the political left may be most inclined to challenge welfare racism if it were able to free itself of immobilizing ideologies, let's take a closer look at its ideological fetters. The dominant left political ideology assumes that if it can just, somehow, move beyond "race" and whatever else divides it, the working class could be united in a broad-based movement for economic justice. Jill Quadagno's *The Color of Welfare* is a case in point. While Quadagno's book makes some noteworthy contributions to our understanding of welfare racism, it is clearly limited by her preoccupation with white working-class attitudes. Despite its title, Quadagno's study focuses more on negative white reactions to the civil rights movement as an obstacle to the evolution of the U.S. welfare state than it does on systemic white racism and the support it receives from racial state elites. Indeed, the moral of Quadagno's analytical story seems to be that white people should not be challenged or provoked. The goal of progressive poverty policy should be to avoid white political backlashes. 15 Central to the denial of the existence or significance of racism is the tendency to ignore the fact that race and racism are essential components of the organization of racialized societies. In such societies it is, by definition, impossible to move "beyond race." Unfortunately, there is a "culture of silence" in contemporary U.S. society regarding white racism. That profound silence has enveloped the highly careerist and politically opportunistic mainstream of U.S. contemporary social science and public policy analysis. 16 Sometimes that silence takes a more active turn as denial, and on occasion the denial becomes militant. The "race" and urban poverty writings of African-American sociologist William J. Wilson are a case in point of the militant denial of the significance of systemic racism in contemporary U.S. society and in its antipoverty policies.

AT: Generic CPs**Any Solvency Deficit is a Reason to Vote Affirmative—Tolerating Any Racism is to Fundamentally Violate What is properly Human**

Albert Memmi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, (p. 165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themselves] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge.

AT: Private CP

Federal Support Skews the Economy Towards Car Ownership Now—Profit Should Not Be the Basis of the Transit System, We Should Provide for Those Most in Need of Affordable Transportation

David Schaengold is a research associate at the [Witherspoon Institute](http://www.witherspooninstitute.org/), “Why Conservatives Should Care About Transit,” Public Discourse, April 17th, 2009 (<http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2009/04/209>)

A common misperception is that the current American state of auto-dependency is a result of the free market doing its work. In fact, a variety of government interventions ensure that the transportation “market” is skewed towards car-ownership. These policy biases are too numerous to list exhaustively, but a few merit special recognition:

-If a state is interested in building a new highway, the only major regulatory obstacle is completing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). After this, the federal government will typically pay for a large portion of the project, and leave the details of its planning and construction to the state’s Department of Transportation. If a state or municipality is interested in a transit project like a subway, a streetcar, or a bus system, however, not only must it complete an EIS, it must also clear a barrage of regulatory hurdles, including a cost-effectiveness analysis, a land-use impact analysis, and a comparison with other transit systems. None of these requirements is necessarily bad in itself (though many of these regulations were designed only to make it harder to build transit systems), but highways aren’t subject to any of them. Naturally, states therefore find it easier to channel transportation dollars into highways.

-As a [2003 report](#) by the Brookings Institution points out, “federal funding for highway projects is more secure and generous than for transit projects; making highway projects easier to finance.” The Department of Transportation will typically match 80% to 90% of state funds directed towards highway repair or construction. Those same funds directed towards transit usually receive less than a 60% federal match, and carry further burdensome requirements for local funding that highway projects do not need to meet.

-Zoning requirements in most municipalities mandate that shops and houses must be separated. It is widely illegal to build the old small-town main street with the mix of shops, houses, and apartments that many find charming (so charming that some of these towns have been turned into tourist attractions). Furthermore, in most states it is mandatory for new schools to be built next to hundreds of acres playing fields, and thus far away from residential neighborhoods (see [this report](#) and [this paper](#) for a fuller discussion of policies that affect travel to school). These and similar regulations ensure that there are no shops or schools—that is, major household destinations—within walking distance of the average American’s home, which in turn requires the average American to own and use a car, not merely to commute to work but to perform basic tasks like picking up a gallon of milk or sending the kids off to school in the morning.

We often hear complaints that transit systems do not earn profits. This is true (with a few exceptions), but this does not mean that transit systems are a waste of money. When was the last time you heard someone complain about how a local road never manages to turn a profit? If we held roads and transit projects to similar standards of profitability, we would build very few roads indeed. Transportation infrastructure is a public good, and few dispute that the government should play an active role in providing it. In spite of the problems with thinking about transit as if it were business, however, transit- and pedestrian-oriented transportation projects would actually benefit if transportation decisions were guided entirely by market forces, because the pro-automobile biases in current policies at the local, state, and federal levels, would be eliminated.

AT: States

Federal Funding Allows Local Decision Makers to Operate Without Constant Fear of Bankruptcy—We Solve the Warrants of the Counterplan Better

Anthony E. Shorris, Professor of Practice at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service, "[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php)" National Journal Transportation Blog, June 1st, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php>)

The only hard question becomes which level of government should provide what share of the operating subsidy appropriate for mass transit systems. Since some of the benefits accrue to commuters in the region served by the transit system, they should certainly chip in, as should residents of the areas served (a balance found in the thoughtful proposal for transit system funding made by former New York MTA Chair Richard Ravitch). But there is a national interest here too. First, since the communities that benefit from cleaner air and less crowded roads often encompass more than one state, there is a role for national government. Even more importantly, shifting riders from cars to transit makes America more secure and less dependent on foreign oil. And perhaps most important of all, a more just distribution of transportation services is an appropriate national policy goal, just as is the equitable distribution of educational or health care services. Indeed, as transportation has become one of the largest household expenses, mechanisms to reduce this cost while achieving other important national benefits may prove highly efficient uses of federal dollars.

One last point: the use of federal transit dollars solely for capital as opposed to operating expense can skew local decision-making away from core maintenance towards system expansion. The federal government should be using the power of its purse to encourage rational decision-making at the local level. While, in the end, all dollars are fungible, a more thoughtful use of federal funds could not only advance the national good by creating a more secure and just America over the long-term, but could improve the quality of our existing transportation systems today.

AT: States (Racism)**States are Empirically Pilots of Racist Violence**

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p..27)

In U.S. society, state actors have historically been extremely important pilots of the racial state. Our use of the term racial state in this book will not only refer to state structure at the federal level. In the United States, the formation and implementation of racial state policy has involved not only the federal government but relatively autonomous individual state and local governments as well. 38 As we will see, by its actions, the federal racial state has affected welfare policy across U.S. society. Yet, by its regulatory omissions and permissions, the federal racial state has also given lower-level governmental bodies political space to tailor policies and practices in ways that meshed with regional or localized race-based mores and patterns of racial inequality. We consider levels of governance below the federal level to be part of the overall racial state structure. The racial state thus operates at multiple levels and, as we will see in subsequent chapters, not always with interlevel consensus and unity.

AT: States (Racism)**Devolution of Policy to State Governments Simply Enables Racism With Less Discretionary Oversight**

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p. 179)

Recent "welfare reform" by the federal racial state has returned enormous discretion to the individual states. It began this devolution of authority by granting many states waivers to the Social Security Act to experiment with their own welfare programs in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The federal racial state then institutionalized the individual states' authority to form and implement their own welfare programs by passing the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. In doing so, the federal racial state effectively shifted back to the welfare policy approach of the pre-1960s states' rights era. For decades, local and state governments adapted their welfare policies and practices to prevailing patterns of white racial hegemony. Particularly, but not exclusively, in the South, this concession to states' rights frequently led to the exclusion of African-American and other families of color from public assistance. Until the civil rights and welfare rights movements successfully challenged welfare racism in the streets, legislative bodies, and the courts in the 1960s, public assistance did not become an "entitlement" in real terms for many families of color. 1 As in the states' rights era, the current policy approach allows states and localities license to express welfare racism—often thinly camouflaged as "race-blind" policies and practices—with relatively little federal oversight or effective constraints.

AT: Generic Ks

The Aff is a Prerequisite—The Function of Permanent Racism Precludes the Ability to Challenge Other Forms of Oppression

Harvard Law Review "BOOK NOTE: AND WE WILL NOT BE SAVED. FACES AT THE BOTTOM OF THE WELL: THE PERMANENCE OF RACISM. By Derrick Bell," April, 1993 (Lexis)

The "faces" in the title of Professor Derrick Bell's new book are those of poor African Americans [are] stranded at the bottom of society's well. Poor whites, who stand only slightly higher, refuse to join forces with their black counterparts in an effort to escape their common plight. Instead, by keeping African Americans in their lowly position, whites derive self-esteem from peering down on them. This stark image that begins *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism* is only the first of many suggesting that "racism is an integral, permanent, and indestructible component of this society" (p. ix). Although powerful and persuasive, the book is interesting as much for its unique style as for its controversial arguments. Professor Bell, well-known as a creative legal writer, believes in "the use of literary models as a more helpful vehicle than legal precedent in a continuing quest for new directions in our struggle for racial justice" (p. ix). ⁿ² *Faces* thus adds to a growing body of scholarship that "attempt[s] to sing a new scholarly song -- even if to some listeners [its] style is strange, [its] lyrics unseemly" (p. 144). ⁿ³ *Faces* contains a melange of literary styles -- anecdotes, science fiction, allegory, and dialogue. Some of Bell's stories come from his own pen and some from the mystical intervention of his muse Geneva Crenshaw, a fictitious civil rights lawyer. The stories are peopled with a variety of characters, who range from a radical white activist training in the Oregon woods to a charismatic black leader who falls in love with a white woman. Through these stories and the dialogues [^{*1359}] between Bell and Crenshaw that usually follow, Bell explores several themes: the frustration of relying on the law to bring about an end to racism; the need for involvement in protests; the belief in freedom symbols by African Americans; the yearning for a true black homeland; and, the rejection of testimony about racial issues when made by blacks (p. 13). The substance of Bell's argument is as straightforward as it is bleak: "[I]t is time to 'get real' about race and the persistence of racism in America" (p.5). Racism is an integral feature of American society; "[e]ven those herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary 'peaks of progress,' short-lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance" (p. 12 (emphasis omitted)). Bell provides several explanations for the persistence of racism. Whites provide blacks "little protection against one or another form of racial discrimination unless granting blacks a measure of relief will serve some interest of importance to whites" (p. 53). Furthermore, poor whites, instead of acknowledging the similarity of their position with that of blacks, are "easily detoured into protecting their sense of entitlement vis-a-vis blacks for all things of value" (p. 7).

AT: Generic Ks**Interrogation of Whiteness is a Prerequisite to the Foundations of Ideology and Ontology You Criticize**

Derrick A. Bell, Visiting Professor, Law, New York University, "David C. Baum Memorial Lecture: Who's Afraid of Critical Race Theory?" UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW, 1995 (p. 901-902)

Critical race theorists strive for a specific, more egalitarian, state of affairs. We seek to empower and include traditionally excluded views and see all-inclusiveness as the ideal because of our belief in collective wisdom. For example, in a recent debate over "hate speech," both Chuck Lawrence and Mari Matsuda made the point [902] that being committed to "free speech" may seem like a neutral principle, but it is not. 28 Thus, proclaiming that "I am committed equally to allowing free speech for the KKK and 2LiveCrew" is a non-neutral value judgment, one that asserts that the freedom to say hateful things is more important than the freedom to be free from the victimization, stigma, and humiliation that hate speech entails. We emphasize our marginality and try to turn it toward advantageous perspective building and concrete advocacy on behalf of those oppressed by race and other interlocking factors of gender, economic class, and sexual orientation. When I say we are marginalized, it is not because we are victim-mongers seeking sympathy in return for a sacrifice of pride. Rather, we see such identification as one of the only hopes of transformative resistance strategy. However, we remain members of the whole set, as opposed to the large (and growing) number of blacks whose poverty and lack of opportunity have rendered them totally silent. We want to use our perspective as a means of outreach to those similarly situated but who are so caught up in the property perspectives of whiteness that they cannot recognize their subordination.

AT: Cap**The Connection Between the Black and Poor is More Important than You Acknowledge—We Cannot Simply Challenge Class Status Without Opposing Racism**

Khiara M. Bridges, PhD Candidate, Anthropology, Columbia University, "Wily Patients, Welfare Queens, and the Reiteration of Race in the U.S.," TEXAS JOURNAL OF WOMEN & THE LAW v. 17, Fall 2007, p. 20-22.

In order to understand the undeserving poor as always already Black, one must acknowledge that the values of capitalism are in synchrony with the values of U.S. nationalism, which is to say that those ideals that are espoused as (U.S.) "American" or are associated with "American"-ness are readily [*21] identifiable as necessary to the successful operation of a capitalist economy. Hence, those characteristics of the ideal wage-laborer - a "good" work ethic, the ability and willingness to "work hard," as well as thriftiness, self-denial, frugality, and economic independence - are also those characteristics extolled as "American." n29 Accordingly, the rejection of this personality - in the form of a perceived "laziness" and an aversion to work, as well as through demonstrations of extravagance, indulgence, intemperance, and economic dependence - is denounced as "un-American." n30 It is for this [*22] reason that the recipients of welfare are condemned in the court of popular opinion as "un-American" insofar as they are perceived to represent par excellence the laziness, work aversion, extravagance, indulgence, intemperance, and economic dependence that threaten the future of "America." n31 In the compelling words of Wahneema Lubiano, the figure of the welfare queen - a "human debit" - derives its problematic status because "responsibility for the destruction of the "American way of life" is attributed to it." n32

AT: Gender Ks**Gender Criticism Fails to Acknowledge the Presence and Importance of Racial Analysis—We Must Do More**

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p. 18)

Gender-centered analyses address ways in which welfare state policies help to sustain and reproduce patriarchy. 6 The drive to maintain male dominance and the patriarchal family is assumed to be the principal force shaping the formation, implementation, and outcomes of U.S. welfare policy. Feminist scholars who address welfare policy from a gender-centered perspective often acknowledge the presence and impact of racism but, as with the class-centered perspective, typically accord racism a position of secondary importance in their analyses. Once again, to be fair, a full exploration of the role played by racism in welfare policy is not their aim, just as a full exploration of the impact of class and gender on U.S. welfare policy is not our objective in this book. The goal of feminist scholars is, of course, to expose the centrality and power of patriarchy in welfare policy and other social realms.

Neg—Transit Funding Unnecessary**Federal Transit Subsidies Should be Abandoned, They Encourage Unnecessary Technology, Waste Money and Make No Sense for Almost All Locations**

Randal O'Toole, Senior Fellow at CATO, "Urban Transit," CATO Institute, Downsizing the Federal Government, June 2010 (<http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit>)

Today, city governments that are frustrated with automobiles and congestion are turning to the 19th century technology of rail transit for relief. But pumping subsidies into rail transit is based on a nostalgic view of the past and is not economically sound. It also won't solve America's congestion woes.

The Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration has an annual budget of more than \$10 billion, nearly all of which is spent on subsidies to state and local governments.² In addition, the economic stimulus bill of 2009 added a further \$8 billion in subsidies over a period of years.³ Through these subsidies and related regulations, federal policymakers play a major role in shaping urban transportation choices.

Transit funding is costly to taxpayers, and it is not a proper function of the federal government. It encourages state and local governments to pursue high-cost and less-efficient transportation solutions—in particular, rail transit. Outside of a few hyper-dense cities in the world, rail transit is a luxury for the few paid for by everyone. Commuter trains and subways may be necessary to keep Manhattan going, but that doesn't mean that everyone else in the nation should subsidize them. Outside of New York City, rail transit makes little economic sense.

The federal government should end its transit subsidies, and American cities should focus on more economically sound and consumer-driven approaches to easing congestion. Policymakers at all levels should work to revive private transit options for cities, and they should allow consumers to pursue their transportation choices in a neutral and competitive market environment.

Neg—Law is Racist**The Legal System's Fundamental Racism Makes Legal Solutions to Race Problems Impossible**

Richard Delgado, Professor, Law, University of Colorado, review of "Recasting the American Race Problem: Rehtinking the American Race Problem," by Roy L. Brooks, CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW, March 1992 (Ilexis)

Our system of antidiscrimination law is designed to detect and punish breaches of the principle of formal equal opportunity (pp. 51-66). For Brooks, as for most liberals, the problems that afflict this approach lie in its implementation. The tests by which courts evaluate claims of unequal treatment are too stringent (pp. 100-01), the burden of proof incorrectly placed (pp. 152-55), the remedies ill-considered (pp. 120-28), and the requirements of proof of intent and causation too strict (p. 155) to enable the law to function effectively. But an emerging counter view holds that the problems with the principle lie not merely with the means by which courts enforce it. Rather: (A) the principle itself is poorly suited to its task— racism and racial subordination are the norm in our society rather than the exception; and (B) members of our culture—including judges—construct key notions like race and racism so as to maintain relations between the races in roughly their current condition.

Neg—Small Changes Don't Solve**Removing Formal Barriers to Racism Doesn't Solve the Overarching Structure—The Plan Won't Make a Difference Overall**

Bernie D. Jones, PhD Candidate, History, University of Virginia, "Critical Race Theory: New Strategies for Civil Rights in the New Millennium?" HARVARD BLACKLETTER LAW JOURNAL v. 18, Spring 2002, p. 24-25.

The quandary faced by civil rights activists lay in the fact that the formal barriers to African American progress--the de jure discrimination they suffered for generations--had been removed. Because the official [*25] barriers had been torn away, it seemed as though the problems of entry had been long resolved; however, the effects of those ancient barriers remained significant. What appeared to be "an unambiguous commitment to antidiscrimination" 91 was in reality, a murky morass of competing interests, where the "conflicting interests actually reinforce existing social arrangements, moderated to the extent necessary to balance the civil rights challenge with the many interests still privileged over it." 92 But since the formal barriers were gone, many thought enough had been done and did not see the need to do anything further. Among this group were those formalists who thought affirmative action was preferential treatment.

Neg—Racism Enduring**Empirically Civil Rights Gains are Eroded, Racism Will be Re-Entrenched**

Tracy E. Higgins, Associate Professor, Law, Fordham University, "Book Review: Derrick Bell's Radical Realism,"
FORDHAM LAW REVIEW v. 61, 1992, (p. 683)

Faces at the Bottom of the Well begins with an introductory chapter in which Professor Bell examines the condition of African-Americans following almost three decades of civil rights litigation. He concludes that "the racism that made slavery feasible is far from dead in the last decade of twentieth century America; and the civil rights gains, so hard won, are being steadily eroded." n4 Although the overt discrimination of the first half of the century has largely been eliminated, Bell cites profound differences that remain between the status of white and black Americans. The unemployment rate for blacks is two-and-one-half times that of whites, n5 for example, and per capita income for blacks is less than two-thirds that of whites. n6

Neg—State is Racist**The State is a Fundamentally Racist Structure—The Aff Can Only Place it Stronger Within American Lives**

Kenneth J. Neubeck and Noel A. Cazenave, Professors of Sociology, WELFARE RACISM: PLAYING THE RACE CARD AGAINST AMERICA'S POOR, 2001, (p. 22-23)

In a similar vein, a number of British scholars have drawn attention to "state racism." 23 Much of their work is in response to the shortcomings of a class-centered perspective for comprehensively handling racism. 24 Controversies surrounding state actors' efforts to control immigration from former colonies in Africa and Asia, and to fight violent crime committed by or aimed at people of color, have helped to energize British scholars' interest in theorizing about the origins and functions of racism in state policy. 25 While developing or presenting a systematic theory of racism and the state is not our purpose in writing this book, in taking a racism-centered approach to U.S. welfare policy we do see the need to make our views about the link between the two explicit. We agree with the premise, advanced by Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, that the United States is a "racialized social system" 26 in which white racism has long been endemic. As many scholars have pointed out, people of European descent historically created the concept of "race" and have used it as the basis for an ideology that denotes a hierarchy of human biological categories in which they, as "whites," assumed superiority. 27 For more than four centuries now, European Americans have relied on this socially constructed hierarchy, and the alleged inherited attributes of different "races," to explain and therefore justify seemingly intractable disparities in power and privilege along color lines. Once having set into motion an ideological justification for these race-based disparities, "whites" have worked relentlessly to keep the disparities intact.

Neg—Spending Links**Federal Spending on Mass Transit Infrastructure Destroys Budget Conditions Now**

Bob Poole, Director of Transportation Studies, Reason Foundation, "[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php)" National Journal Transportation Blog, June 4th, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php>)

Urban Mass Transit is not a National Problem

At a time of unprecedented federal deficits, the idea of expanding the federal government's spending into what is basically a local issue requires a very high level of justification. The others who have posted on this blog, arguing in favor of federal funding for transit operating costs, have failed to meet that standard.

Merely desiring federal money and having something nice to spend it on is hardly a justification. Not when, according to the Government Accountability Office, "the federal government's financial condition and fiscal outlook are worse than many may understand. Specifically, the federal budget is on an unsustainable path—raising questions about whether people should assume federal funds will be available to help solve the nation's current infrastructure challenges." (GAO-08-763T, May 8, 2008)

Neg—States Solve

Federal Transit Funding Leads Localities Astray—State and Local Governments Will Make Better Decisions on Their Own

Randal O'Toole, Senior Fellow at CATO, "Urban Transit," CATO Institute, Downsizing the Federal Government, June 2010 (<http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit>)

The first step toward reform is to remove federal subsidies and related regulations from the transit equation. Federal intervention creates all kinds of perverse incentives for state and local governments. These include the following:

Cities are encouraged to build very inefficient rail lines because more than half of all federal funds are dedicated to rail transit.

Transit agencies are encouraged to find the most expensive transit solutions because rail construction funds are an open bucket—first-come, first-served.

Innovative transit solutions are bypassed and high costs are guaranteed because of the requirement that transit agencies obtain the approval of their unions to be eligible for federal grants.

Local transit agencies have strong incentives to claim success with their projects no matter how badly they fail because of the requirement that agencies must refund federal grants if projects are cancelled.

Federal rules impose a transit planning process that is biased in favor of higher-cost transit projects, and the process allows agencies to systematically low-ball cost estimates and overstate potential ridership.

Federal subsidies have been mainly directed to capital costs of local transit, not operating costs. That has led to a host of distortions, such as agencies favoring rail over buses and favoring larger buses when smaller ones would do the job.

Many federal regulations distort the flow of funding to the most efficient solutions, such as rules that tie the distribution of transportation funds to air quality planning.

These factors and others have promoted less efficient transportation solutions than would have likely been employed without federal intervention. I have discussed these problems elsewhere at length.⁶¹

With the federal government out of the picture, state and local governments would need to rethink their own urban transit financing. One problem is that the average American transit agency gets only a third of its operating funds and none of its capital funds from fares. This means that transit officials are less interested in increasing transit ridership than they are in persuading politicians and taxpayers to give them more money. Increased ridership is actually a burden on transit systems: even though transit vehicles are, on average, only one-sixth full, they tend to be fullest during rush hour, when new riders are most likely to use transit.

Neg—States Solve**Federal Funding for Transit Projects is the Wrong Solution, Lower Levels of Government Should Take Over**

Gabriel Roth, Research Fellow, The Independent Institute, "No Limits to Federal Involvement?" February 13th, 2012 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/transit-walkers-bikers-up-in-a.php>)

"Where", asks Fawn, "does safety factor in to this conversation?" As the federal government reduces safety by "blood for oil" policies encouraging the use of lightweight cars, the safety factor illustrates the unfortunate unintended consequences of federal interventions in transportation, which already increase US highway fatalities by some 2,000 a year.

A rational federal government seeking to reduce the consumption of fossil fuel would raise the taxes on it. And a rational federal government, seeking to finance transport activities with money it does not have, would confine its spending to projects of specific federal importance, and leave to governments at lower levels the financing of local matters, such as transit, cycling and walking programs.

So, if governments behaved rationally, "Transit groups, along with pedestrian and cycling advocates", would focus their estimable activities on local governments.

Neg—States Solve**State and Local Funding is More Efficient and Better Directed**

Jeff Rosen, Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, "[Time For Feds To Fund Mass Transit Operating Expenses?](http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php)" National Journal Transportation Blog, June 14th, 2009 (<http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2009/06/is-it-time-for-the-feds-to-fun.php>)

Where additional expenditures for transit are warranted, state and local governments are in the better position to decide such spending, with funds from their own taxpayers and system users. Not only is that more efficient, but it provides more accountability and transparency than a situation where the spending is done by state political officials but the taxing (or borrowing) is attributed to the federal government. Why should residents of a state want their tax dollars sent to Washington, D.C. to be forwarded back to government authorities in their own state to spend with federal "strings" attached?

Finally, it is often true that state and local governments have tight budgets and scarce resources. But the federal government's fiscal condition is no better. The Obama Administration expects to run a record budget deficit of approximately \$3 trillion for its first two years. We want good transit systems as part of our overall transportation system, but should we significantly expand the federal role to address local operating budgets? Perhaps there are special situations that might warrant exceptions, but in general, where local transit operations need more funding, the pragmatic response is that it should remain incumbent on responsible state and local officials to devise the necessary funding and spending solutions.